EXHIBIT J

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS MARSHALL DIVISION

RAMOT AT TEL AVIV UNIVERSITY LTD.,

No. 2:19-cv-225-JRG

Plaintiff,

VS.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.,

Defendant.

CISCO'S PROPOSED VERDICT FORM

In answering these questions, you are to follow all of the instructions I have given you in the Court's Final Instructions to the Jury. As used in this form, "Ramot" means Ramot at Tel Aviv University Ltd.; and "Cisco" means Cisco Systems, Inc. "Ramot's Patents" mean U.S. Patent Nos. 10,033,465 ("the '465 patent"), 10,270,535 ("the '535 patent"), and 10,461,866 ("the '866 patent").

Question 1: Direct Infringement

Did Ramot prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Cisco has literally infringed the asserted claims of Ramot's Patents by its use of the accused products presented at trial?

If you find the claim was infringed, answer "Yes" (a "Yes" is a finding for Ramot); otherwise, answer "No" (a "No" is a finding for Cisco):

<u>'465 Pa</u>	<u>atent</u>
Claim 1	
<u>'535 Pa</u>	<u>atent</u>
Claim 1	
Claim 2	
<u>'866 Pa</u>	atent
Claim 7	
Claim 8	
Claim 10	
Claim 11	
Claim 12	

Question 2: Induced Infringement

Did Ramot prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Cisco indirectly infringed the asserted claims of Ramot's Patents by actively inducing its customers to directly infringe the asserted claims?

If you find the claim was infringed, answer "Yes" (a "Yes" is a finding for Ramot); otherwise, answer "No" (a "No" is a finding for Cisco):

Question 3: Invalidity

Did Cisco prove by clear and convincing evidence that the following claims of the following patents are invalid?

If you find the claim invalid, answer "Yes" (a "Yes" is a finding for Cisco); otherwise, answer "No" (a "No" is a finding for Ramot):

<u>'465 P</u>	<u>atent</u>
Claim 1	
<u>'535 P</u>	<u>atent</u>
Claim 1	
Claim 2	
<u>'866 P</u>	<u>atent</u>
Claim 7	
Claim 8	
Claim 10	
Claim 11	

Question 4: Damages

Answer if you found at least one claim infringed in Question 1 ("Yes") and not invalid ("No") in Question 2:

Would Ramot and Cisco have agreed to a running royalty or a lump sum?
Lump Sum
Running Royalty
If you believe that a lump sum license would have been negotiated for Cisco's use during
the lifetime of Ramot's Patents (answer the question below only if you selected "Lump Sum"
above):
1. What sum of money do you find from a preponderance of the evidence would fairly and
reasonably compensate Ramot for past and future use by Cisco of the patented
inventions, up through the expiration of the patents?
Total Amount of Lump Sum Damages: \$
Total Amount of Lump Sum Damages: \$ If instead, you believe that Ramot is entitled to receive a running royalty for Cisco's
If instead, you believe that Ramot is entitled to receive a running royalty for Cisco's
If instead, you believe that Ramot is entitled to receive a running royalty for Cisco's infringement (answer the three questions below only if you selected "Running Royalty" above):
If instead, you believe that Ramot is entitled to receive a running royalty for Cisco's infringement (answer the three questions below only if you selected "Running Royalty" above): 1. What royalty rate do you find from a preponderance of the evidence the parties would
If instead, you believe that Ramot is entitled to receive a running royalty for Cisco's infringement (answer the three questions below only if you selected "Running Royalty" above): 1. What royalty rate do you find from a preponderance of the evidence the parties would have agreed to?
If instead, you believe that Ramot is entitled to receive a running royalty for Cisco's infringement (answer the three questions below only if you selected "Running Royalty" above): 1. What royalty rate do you find from a preponderance of the evidence the parties would have agreed to? 2. What royalty base do you find from a preponderance of the evidence the parties would

Question 5: Willful Infringement

For any patent that included one claim that you found infringed in either Question 1 or 2 ("Yes") and not invalid ("No") in Question 3, did Ramot prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Cisco's infringement(s) was willful?

evidence that Cisco's infringement(s) was willful?
Answer YES or NO in the spaces provided:
'465 Patent:
'535 Patent:
'866 Patent:
THE FOREPERSON MUST SIGN AND DATE THIS VERDICT FORM.
Signed this day of December, 2020.
FOREPERSON